

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance.

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, and the remarks that follow as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes and remarks are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

Claims 1-25 are pending. Claims 1-14 are amended and claims 15-25 are newly added, without prejudice. No new matter is added by these amendments. Support for the amended recitations in the claims is found throughout the specification, and particularly, on page 29, lines 1-18 and page 35, lines 7-13 of the present specification.

The Examiner objected to the title of the invention. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that the title of the invention was not descriptive. The title of the invention has been amended herein to be more descriptive as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the objection to the title of the invention be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) allegedly as being anticipated by Everhart et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,347). Applicant disagrees.

For example, claim 1, as amended herein, recites in part, "An information processing apparatus...comprising...command definition information obtaining means...wherein when one

**or more of said plurality of electronic apparatuses are disconnected from said network, previously stored command definition information is either (i) removed from said storage means or (ii) temporarily stored in said storage means.**” (Underlining and Bold added for emphasis.)

It is respectfully submitted that the portions of Everhart relied upon by the Examiner neither disclose nor enable at least the above-recited feature of claim 1.

Everhart relates to a voice activated control system located in a vehicle for recognizing spoken sounds and transmitting corresponding commands. The instantly claimed invention, on the other hand, discloses that when one or more of a plurality of electronic apparatuses are disconnected from a network, previously stored command definition information is either (i) removed from a storage means or (ii) temporarily stored in the storage means, as instantly claimed. Everhart is not concerned with electronic apparatuses that are connected and/or disconnected from a network because the user of the vehicle is not permitted to connect or disconnect electronic apparatuses in such an environment. For example, once the manufacturer of the vehicle programs all the desired electronic apparatuses on a network, then the network cannot be modified (by adding or removing electronic apparatuses) at any time by a user. Therefore, the instant claims are believed to be distinguishable from Everhart for at least the reasons stated above.

For reasons similar to those described above, claim 13 is also believed to be distinguishable from Everhart.

Claims 2, 6, 7 and 10 depend from claim 1 and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from Everhart for at least the reasons previously described.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Everhart be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) allegedly as being unpatentable over Everhart et al. in view of Vanbuskirk et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,308,157). Applicant disagrees.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1, and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from Everhart for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Vanbuskirk to overcome the above-identified deficiencies of Everhart. Therefore, claims 3 and 4 are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Everhart and Vanbuskirk.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Everhart and Vanbuskirk be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 5, 8 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) allegedly as being unpatentable over Everhart et al. Applicant disagrees.

For reasons similar to those described above regarding claim 1, claim 14 is also believed to be distinguishable from Everhart.

Claims 5 and 8 depend from claim 1, and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be distinguishable from Everhart for at least the reasons previously described. Therefore, claims 5 and 8 are believed to be distinguishable from Everhart.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 5, 8 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Everhart be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) allegedly as being unpatentable over Everhart et al. in view of Nguyen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,219,703). Applicant disagrees.

Claim 9 depends from claim 1, and, due to such dependency, is also believed to be distinguishable from Everhart for at least the reasons previously described.

Nguyen discloses a processing system that is programmed to detect a new device present on a network and in response to such detection, the processing system accesses data describing the new device (column 2, lines 7-11). However, Nguyen does not mention anything concerning a device being disconnected from the network. In addition, Nguyen does not mention that “previously stored command definition information is either (i) removed from said storage means or (ii) temporarily stored in said storage means” when a disconnection occurs, as instantly claimed. Therefore, claim 9 is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Everhart and Nguyen.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Everhart and Nguyen be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) allegedly as being unpatentable over Everhart et al. in view of Diehl et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,666). Applicant disagrees.

Claim 11 depends from claim 1, and, due to such dependency, is also believed to be distinguishable from Everhart for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Diehl to overcome the above-identified deficiencies of Everhart. Therefore, claim 11 is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Everhart and Diehl.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Everhart and Diehl be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) allegedly as being unpatentable over Everhart et al. in view of Peck et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,375,063). Applicant disagrees.

Claim 12 depends from claim 1, and, due to such dependency, is also believed to be distinguishable from Everhart for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Peck to overcome the above-identified deficiencies of Everhart. Therefore, claim 12 is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Everhart and Peck.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Everhart and Peck be reconsidered and withdrawn.


Applicant has further added new claims 15-25, which are method claims that correspond to apparatus claims 2-12. Applicant submits that the 35 U.S.C. 102(e)/103(a) rejections relied upon by the Examiner do not apply to claims 15-25, and submits that the rejection of these claims over 35 U.S.C. 102(e)/103(a) would be improper.

The Examiner has apparently made of record, but not relied upon, a number of documents. The applicant appreciates the Examiner's explicit finding that these documents, whether considered alone or in combination with others, do not render the claims of the present application unpatentable.

In the event that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where in the reference or references, there is the bases for a contrary view.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By:   
Samuel H. Megerditchian  
Reg. No. 45,678